REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 10-21 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-9 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orszulik (WO 01/59196) hereinafter "Orszulik") in view of Oh et al. (US 6,116,061) (hereinafter "Oh").

Claims 1-9

Claim 1 recites: "...spin-drying laundry by operating a motor to rotate a rotary tub after a washing and/or rinsing operation; stopping operation of the motor; and spraying and feeding water into the rotary tub during a time period when the rotary tub is inertially rotating after stopping operation of the motor." The Office Action notes that Orzulik does not discuss the feature of claim 1 of stopping operation of the motor. Instead, the Office Action relies on Oh to show this feature of claim 1. However, Oh does not discuss stopping the motor and then spraying water into the tub. Instead, Oh discusses that water discharged to the laundry is exerted of a centrifugal force in a radial direction, a rotational force in a circumferential direction and gravity. If rotational speed of the inner tub 3 is changed, interaction between these forces is changed. That is, even if the sprayed water hits at a same position of the laundry, a path of the water until the water escapes from the inner tub 3 through the discharge holes in a side thereof can be changed. Therefore, by an appropriate change of the rotational speed of the inner tub 3, the water can be made to thread through every corners of the laundry to remove contaminants therefrom. See Oh, 4:20-4:30 and Figure 4.

It is respectfully submitted that Oh does not discuss stopping the motor and the statement that changing the speed of the motor is equivalent to stopping the motor is respectfully traversed. Further, Oh clearly discusses that the rinsing operations are both done while the inner tub is rotating with the brake disengaged. See Oh 5:2-5:12.

Still further, in the present invention as recited in claim 1, the inertially rotating of the rotary drum is carried out after the rinsing process is finished. In contrast, the variation of the rotation speed of the drum Oh is carried out in the middle of the rinsing process.

Accordingly, the inertially rotating of the rotary drum of the present invention is carried out when the motor is off. In contrast, the variation of the rotation speed of the drum Oh is carried out when the motor is still working on.

This technical feature of claim 1 enables laundry to be uniformly soaked with the water within a short time and improving rinsing performance and overall efficiency of the washing machine.

Claims 2-9 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct 10, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper

Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501